

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2005, claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,800).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The Applicant's invention now includes in claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 providing predefined **restricted temporary access** to the device if the user is locally authenticated and **removing** the **restricted** temporary access to predefined access areas if remote authentication is successful (see paragraph [0031] of Applicant's published patent application). In addition, claim 19 contains **limiting a number of times** that a particular client database and/or record in any, or all, of the client databases will be **updated** during any period of time and/or total number of updates (see paragraph [0030] of Applicant's published patent application).

In contrast, although Henry et al. disclose a system that can "...locally authenticate an arriving mobile...and thus grant temporary access..." (see col. 3, lines 2-5), the system in Henry et al. does **not restrict temporary access** to the device if the user is locally authenticated, like the Applicant's claimed invention. Instead, Henry et al. explicitly states that after local authentication, "...the mobile host 200 is temporarily enabled on the new access network, and thus can respectively send and receive packets to and from the network." Thus, Henry et al. allows full access and does **not** provide predefined **restricted temporary access** to the device if the user is locally authenticated and then **remove** the **restricted** temporary access to predefined access areas if remote authentication is successful, as claimed by the Applicant.

In addition, regarding claim 19, Henry et al. does not **limit a number of times** that a particular client database and/or record in any, or all, of the client databases will be **updated** during any period of time and/or total number of updates, like the Applicant's claimed invention.

Serial No.: 10/003,138
Attorney Docket No.: 10008052-J

Hence, since the cited reference does not disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention, the reference cannot anticipate the claims. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.


With regard to the rejection of the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: June 7, 2005



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX